

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/052,156	(01/16/2002	Robert Edward Kohler	11587.60US01 1036	
22852	7590	09/23/2004		EXAMINER	
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER				HO, UYEN T	
LLP 1300 I STRE	FT NW			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20005			•	3731	

DATE MAILED: 09/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Commons	10/052,156	MOWRY ET AL.	$\overline{\bigcirc U}$				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	(Jackie) Tan-Uyen T. Ho	3731	٦				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	dress				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	66(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days fill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely the mailing date of this co D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	<i>y.</i> ommunication				
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 Ju	ily 2004.						
/							
closed in accordance with the practice under E	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-28</u> is/are pending in the application.							
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-28</u> is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		,					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).					
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 							
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage							
application from the International Bureau			•				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)					
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) 	Paper No(s)/Mail D		O-152)				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/21/04</u> .	·/ L · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						

Art Unit: 3731

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. The amendments and Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1,10, 15, 25, 26-28 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant argues that Gregory do not disclose the tubing including a portion in extension away from the scaffold or the tubing second end forming an end of said extension remote from the scaffold. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Fig. 9 of Gregory discloses the unfolded end as a portion in extension away from the scaffold before it completely covers the stent.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gregory '379 in view of Tweden et al. (5,984,956 incorporated by applicant). Gregory discloses all the limitation of the claim except for a presence of a sleeve surrounding a portion of the tubing. Tweden et al. disclose a sleeve having material inducing tissue growth surrounding a vascular implant (col. 3). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the sleeve as disclosed by Tweden et al. into the Gregory's vascular implant in order to

induce tissue growth thereby secure the implant to the wall of a vessel. Doing so would meet all the limitations as claimed.

In regard to claim 5 and 20, although Gregory does not disclose stent/scaffold having a L-shape, it is well known in the ad to make a stent having a shape that can accommodate and support vessel having branches and the common shape of a stent for support vessel wall are tubular I, L, Y-shape. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Gregory's implant (20) to have a L shape in order to accommodate and support vessel having branches.

In regard to claim 25, although, Gregory does not disclose all the steps as claimed, it is known in the ad to use a stent-graft for performing a coronary vessel bypass and the implant/stent-graft as disclosed by Gregory is well suit for a bypass in a blood vessel. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the Gregory's implant/stent-graft for performing a coronary vessel bypass. Doing so would meet all tie steps as claimed.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to (Jackie) Tan-Uyen T. Ho whose telephone number is (703) 306-3421. The examiner can normally be reached on MULTIFLEX Mon. to Sat.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, McDermott or Shaver can be reached on 703-308-0858. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3731

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

(Jackie) Tan-Uyen T. Ho

Patent Examiner Art Unit 3731

September 20, 2004